

Date: Sun, 30 Jan 94 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #31
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 30 Jan 94 Volume 94 : Issue 31

Today's Topics:

 FCC form 610-V
 non-ham using ham station legally?
 Tech->General Upgrade Question (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 1994 15:01:31 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
paladin.american.edu!zombie.ncsc.mil!cs.umd.edu!ra!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC form 610-V
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2i9483\$n3c@cronkite.nersc.gov> of rec.radio.amateur.misc
Greg@epitome.er.doe.gov (Greg Chartrand) writes:

>
> In the FCC announcement regarding vanity callsigns, they stated that
> every application for a specific callsign would have to be made on a
> form 610-V.
>
> [the rest deleted]

So what's all this stuff about vanity callsigns? Is it now, or will it
be possible in the future to choose your own callsign, assuming, of
course, that someone else doesn't already have it? (I wouldn't mind
getting W4DMD.) I've been marginally active for the past four years, so
I'm not familiar on the latest changes to the rules and regulations.

BTW, in the latest issue of QST I noticed that most of the two by three amateur callsigns (technician/general) have been issued. I assume that the FCC is now issuing novice callsigns to new tech/tech+/general licensees. Is this true? In light of this, is there any serious talk about reissuing callsigns from expired licenses?

-Dave

--

David M. Drumheller, KA3QBQ phone: (202) 767-3524
Acoustics Division, Code 7140 fax: (202) 404-7732
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375-5350 e-mail: drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 94 21:21:48 -0500
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: non-ham using ham station legally?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Matthew...

It's Part 97 of Volume 47 (Telecommunications) of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

..Neil, N3DF

Date: 29 Jan 1994 06:00:06 GMT
From: korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!pongo!myers@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Tech->General Upgrade Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <patrick_tatro.8.7C558180@stortek.com> patrick_tatro@stortek.com (Patrick Tatro) writes:

>In article <1994Jan26.235533.12729@radian.uucp> philr%radian@natinst.com (Phil Riba) writes:

>>From: philr%radian@natinst.com (Phil Riba)

>>Subject: Tech->General Upgrade Question

>>Date: Wed, 26 Jan 1994 23:55:33 GMT

>

>>I upgraded my original Novice license to my current Technician license
>>about eight years ago. I'm thinking about brushing up on my code to go
>>for my General.

>

>>Is it still just a code test, or is there more to it with the new
>>license structure? Is there some statute of limitations time period
>>that I should be concerned with?

No. You need to be able to prove when you passed your Technician
test, since you passed the General written and the Novice code
to get your Tech. In 1987 there was a written test added for the
Technician, but you already have credit for the General written.
If you had passed your Tech in or after 1987, you'd have to
pass the General written.

All you need is 5WPM and proof that your Technician license was
issued before 1987.

> I'm a Tech working on my General. You need to take the written exam and
>the 13wpm code test for General. I've taken the written exam and it's not that
>bad. It's a little harder than the Tech test. The 13wpm is the hard part and
>with practice it can be done. The ARRL publishes a study guide for the written
>test. Good luck on your upgrade efforts. 73's

Careful; have a look at Part 97 when answering policy questions :-).

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Wed, 26 Jan 1994 23:55:33 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!natinst.com!radian!philr@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Tech->General Upgrade Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I upgraded my original Novice license to my current Technician license
about eight years ago. I'm thinking about brushing up on my code to go
for my General.

Is it still just a code test, or is there more to it with the new
license structure? Is there some statute of limitations time period
that I should be concerned with?

-+--+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-+-*-*

Anything resembling an opinion is strictly coincidental

Phil E. Riba, CCP, REM
Internet: philr@zippy.radian.com
Packet Radio: ka5pvh@n5ljf.aus.tx.na

Radian Corporation
Austin, Texas USA
PGP public key available on request

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 1994 15:01:35 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!world!collinst@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CK6rp4.Azy@world.std.com>, <1994Jan25.141310.3817@cs.brown.edu>,
<1994Jan25.190506.1748@es.dupont.com>, <1994Jan26.142439.19433@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses

Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu) wrote:
: In article <1994Jan25.190506.1748@es.dupont.com>,
: collinst@esvx19.es.dupont.com (Thomas Collins WI3P) writes:

: |> And 3. It will ensure the Amateur Ranks shrink to its smallest number
: |> giving the FCC and Commerical outfits more reason to sell/buy our
: |> frequencies. (IMHO) There will be too many who don't want to sweat
: |> out tests every 5 or 10 years and will just give up on ARS as a hobby.

: The point is not to sweat out tests every 5 to 10 years, but retest
: those who let their license lapse.

Then I suggest you make that clear in either your message,
or the *quoted* portion you include. If you re-read your
you original message it can be taken either way.

: I doubt that "the amateur ranks shrink to its smallest number..." will
: occur. Look at the number of "active" ham operators today in relation
: to the whole.

: If you want to swell the ranks, then you must be a proponent of
: eliminating all testing, to maximize the number of people who want
: to get into the hobby.

As a *mind reader* your a bust. No job with the
Psychic Network.... 8-)

I'm in favor of both Code and *Tougher* written tests,
(not by VE's but the old fashion way in front of the
FCC.) Unlike others here who want to include the
license application with the Transceivers like they
use to do with CBs.

--

Thanks & 73	"It's been too hard living, But I'm afraid to die
Thomas Collins <WI3P>	Don't know what's up there, Beyond the sky."
collinst@world.std.com	Sam Cooke, 'A Change Is Gonna Come'
_____	_____

Date: 27 Jan 1994 16:30:30 GMT

From: news.cstar.andersen.com!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!

lapin@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jan24.213138.7571@cs.brown.edu>, <hamilton.759455446@BIX.com>,
<1994Jan26.012703.3451@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>u.edu

Subject : Re: Antenna Lawsuit

In article <1994Jan26.012703.3451@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>In article <hamilton.759455446@BIX.com> hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX)
writes:

>>I think you're being rather insensitive to Mr. Stoner's plight, especially
>>considering that none of us knows quite how he got there.

>>

>>Incidentally, the case mentions that Mr. Stoner had been a ham for
>>40-some years and that the covenant was forcing him to give up the
>>relationships he'd formed over that period. So clearly, he did not
>>purchase the property prior to becoming involved in ham.radio.

>

>Please note that Don Stoner has been a gadfly and troublemaker for
>most of his 40 years as an amateur. This is almost certainly a
>contrived situation designed to give him standing in a lawsuit.

>

>Gary

>--

>Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
>Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
>534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
>Lawrenceville, GA 30244			

I guess you aren't one of those many friends that Don has made in amateur
radio, Gary! :)

Greg

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #31
